REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been examined. New claims 11-14 have been added to further describe patentable aspects of the invention.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview of October 4, 2007, during which claim 1 was discussed in view of Urs (US 6,292,781). Applicants set forth below arguments in response to the Examiner's position, which were similarly discussed in the interview. In addition, the Examiner requested Applicants to point to portions in the specification which support the claimed features of the control and response signals, particularly, each of said control signals and said response signals comprising both speech recognition and non-speech recognition related parts. The sixth full paragraph on page 2 of the specification is at least one instance which supports "control signals comprising speech-recognition related parts and/or non-speech recognition related parts." Also, the second full paragraph on page 3 of the specification is at least one instance which supports "response signals comprise speech-recognition related parts and/or non-speech recognition related parts." Furthermore, the third full paragraph on page 10 of the specification recites:

> All embodiments are just embodiments and do not exclude other embodiments not shown and/or described. All alternatives are just alternatives and do not exclude other alternatives not shown and/or described. Any (part of an) embodiment and/or any (part of an) alternative can be combined with any other (part of an) embodiment and/or any other (part of an) alternative.

Therefore, support exists in the specification wherein each of said control signals and said response signals comprising both speech recognition and non-speech recognition related parts.

That is, both control signals and response signals comprise of both speech recognition related parts and non-speech recognition related parts.

I.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner continues to maintain her rejection, rejecting claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipicated by Urs et al. (US 6,292,781). In particular, the Examiner asserts:

> [Urs discloses] each of said control signals and said response comprising both speech recognition (user inputs voice commands or communication service requests) and non-speech recognition (keypress information from keypad 320) related parts (communication unit (102) requests communication services from the communication infrastructure (101) that support both voice and data communication and as such, the system of Urs reads on the detection and appropriate processing of speech and non-speech data in control and/or response signals, since the system of Urs specifically provides for processing both voice and data information in the communication signals transmitted to and from the user and the various components of the communication system with the voice and data path being utilized simultaneously by the communication unit when the wireless resource communication is shared).

Although Urs may disclose supporting both voice and data communication and that a user may be connected to a voice path and a data path simultaneously, Urs fails to teach or suggest that <u>each control signal</u> and <u>each response signal</u> comprises <u>both</u> a speech recognition related part <u>and</u> a non-speech recognition related part. For example, claim 1 recites, in part, a switch which "comprises a detector for detecting speech-recognition and non-speech recognition related parts in the control signals and the response signals, and a processor for, in response to a

detection of the speech-recognition or non-speech recognition related parts, processing the

control signals and the response signals, <u>each of said control signals and said response signals</u>

<u>comprising both speech recognition and non-speech recognition related parts</u>."

The communication infrastructure of Urs establishes a voice path and a data path such

that a communication service may support <u>alternate</u> voice and data communication (col. 2,

lines 40-63). More particularly, a distributed speech processing unit 216 receives both voice

communication and data communication from the communication unit 202 and a switching

center 208 <u>alternatively</u> switches between the voice path and the data path (col. 6, lines 25-52).

That is, a communication unit <u>alternatively</u> exchanges voice communication with a first

destination client, a communication device (i.e., voice recognition device), and data

communication with a second destination client, a distributed speech processing unit for

synthesis into speech (col. 6, lines 62-66). For example, if the voice path is currently being used

for voice communication between the communication unit 102 and the communication device, a

user of the communication unit may "put the call on hold" and thereby send an indication to

switch from the voice path to the data path (col. 5, lines 24-29). The path is switched according

to <u>either a request for voice connection or a request for data connection</u> (col. 7, lines 23-31).

Thus, the requests are clearly separate and distinct from each other. That is because <u>only one of</u>

<u>the connections may be utilized at a time</u> (col. 7, lines 34-35). Accordingly, speech processing

data is extracted from a voice signal for voice recognition <u>or</u> textual information is synthesized

into speech.

In view of the above, however, Urs clearly describes that the control signals and the response signals which include a speech recognition related part is separate and distinct from the control signals and the response signals which include a non-speech recognition related part. Thus, although Urs may disclose a communication infrastructure that supports both voice and data communication, Urs merely notes that voice and data paths may be established simultaneously. But again, only one of these connections is used at a given time and an established path is not equivalent to the claimed control signal and response signal. Moreover, Urs emphasizes repeatedly that the control signals or the response signals contain only one recognition related part (i.e., either a speech recognition related part or a non-speech recognition related part). Urs, however, does not disclose a control signal or a response signal in which a speech recognition related part and a non-speech recognition related part is simultaneously contained therein. That is, Urs at best discloses that the speech recognition related parts are contained in signals which are separate and distinct from the signals containing non-speech recognition related parts.

Further, the Examiner cites Urs' disclosure that the voice path and data path are conveyed via the same physical link to the distributed speech processing unit as allegedly disclosing the claimed feature. However, Urs, at the cited lines, does not disclose the claimed response signals. Merely because the voice and data path are conveyed via the same physical link (e.g., a cable) does not mean that a signal on that link includes speech-recognition and non-speech recognition related parts. Nor is this feature inherent from the cited disclosure because the physical link may

include many different signals, each including either a speech or non-speech related part. Thus, Urs does not disclose the claimed response signals which are sent from memory and are composed of both speech-recognition and non-speech-recognition related parts, and then processed in response to the detection of speech-recognition or non-speech-recognition related parts, as set forth by the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Urs does not teach or suggest a switch which "comprises a detector for detecting speech-recognition and non-speech recognition related parts in the control signals and the response signals, and a processor for, in response to a detection of the speech-recognition or non-speech recognition related parts, processing the control signals and the response signals, each of said control signals and said response signals comprising both speech recognition and non-speech recognition related parts." Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 should be allowable over the Urs reference.

Claims 5, 8 and 10 include analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features, and therefore, claims 5, 8 and 10 are also patentable for the reasons discussed for claim 1.

Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

II.   New claims

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 11-14 to further define the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits claims 11-14 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 9, 2007